

Review of Research in Education

<http://rre.aera.net>

Re-mediating Literacy: Culture, Difference, and Learning for Students From Nondominant Communities

Kris D. Gutiérrez, P. Zitlali Morales and Danny C. Martinez
REVIEW OF RESEARCH IN EDUCATION 2009; 33; 212
DOI: 10.3102/0091732X08328267

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://rre.sagepub.com/cgi/content/full/33/1/212>

Published on behalf of



American
Educational
Research
Association

<http://www.aera.net>

By



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Review of Research in Education* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://rre.aera.net/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://rre.aera.net/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.aera.net/reprints>

Permissions: <http://www.aera.net/permissions>

Chapter 8

Re-mediating Literacy: Culture, Difference, and Learning for Students From Nondominant Communities

KRIS D. GUTIÉRREZ

P. ZITLALI MORALES

DANNY C. MARTINEZ

University of California, Los Angeles

In this chapter, we examine notions of educational risk in the context of literacy theories and research. Deficit notions about the cognitive potential of individuals from nondominant¹ communities have persisted in social science inquiry, particularly where literacy is concerned. The intellectual trails of current conflicting ideas about literacy can be traced in part to theories about the role of literacy in society. For example, the great divide theories of literacy, sustained by a view of culture as social evolution and progress (Cole, 2005), attributed significant differences to the cognitive and cultural development of literate and nonliterate people and their communities (Goody, 1977, 1986, 1987; Goody & Watt, 1963; Havelock, 1963; Ong, 1982).² This literacy thesis held that there were “categorical differences in cognition and language as consequences of literacy” (Reder & Davila, 2005, p. 171)—differences marked by stark dualities used to characterize literate and nonliterate communities: writing versus orality, modern versus traditional, and educated versus uneducated, for example (Collins, 1995, p. 75). As Reder and Davila (2005) have noted, “literacy was presumed to have broad and ubiquitous consequences in such areas as: abstract versus context-dependent uses and genre of language; logical, critical, and scientific versus irrational modes of thought; analytical history versus myth; and so forth” (p. 171). These theories of literacy were challenged for their wide-ranging dichotomies that perpetuated the hierarchical differences between “types of societies, modes of thought, and uses of language” (p. 171) and reductive notions of culture and thought (Cole & Scribner, 1974, 1977).

Review of Research in Education

March 2009, Vol. 33, pp. 212-245

DOI: 10.3102/0091732X08328267

© 2009 AERA. <http://rre.aera.net>

By the 1980s, the notion of the divide was challenged, and new work represented the link between literacy and orality as a continuum (see Coulmans & Ehlich, 1983). As Brian Street (1993) observed, the shift was more theoretical; that is, researchers held to views of literacy, as distinguished from orality and its consequences. Here, the metaphor of a divide or a continuum suggests a deficit in people whose literacy practices differ from those of dominant groups and are considered to be normative; such metaphors perpetuate what Street calls *autonomous models of literacy*, organized around the assumption that literacy will have effects on other social and cognitive practices (p. 77). Of relevance to present views of difference and diversity, these dichotomies have helped to frame the way that we view and study the literacies of nondominant communities, their members, and their practices.

In contrast to the ubiquitous autonomous model, models such as the ideological model advanced by new literacy studies (Street, 1984) reflect a culturally sensitive account of literacy that rejects static and homogeneous views of the literacy practices of cultural communities. In contrast to views of literacy as a “technical and neutral [and autonomous] skill” (Street, 2003, p. 2), an ideological model posits that literacy is always embedded in social practices, where the consequences of learning a literacy are dependent on its context of development. Viewing literacy as a social practice exposes the long-standing belief that introducing literacy to the poor, “culturally deprived,” and “illiterate” communities (p. 1) will enhance their cognitive skills and so improve the economic conditions that created the illiteracy in the first place. In this chapter, we examine the flaws in dominant stereotypes regarding literacy; the views linked to autonomous conceptions of literacy; and the deficit discourses, theories, and methods of inquiry that have accompanied such models. We conclude by revisiting arguments against narrow perspectives and by urging critical arguments around re-mediating literacy.

A FUNCTIONAL SYSTEMS APPROACH TO THE CONSEQUENCES OF LITERACY

The literacy thesis and notions about the broad consequences of the effects of literacy are aligned with general notions of the expansive consequences of schooling, challenged decades ago by Sylvia Scribner and Michael Cole (1973). Through cross-cultural research, Scribner and Cole rejected extant methods of inquiry that could render only deficit views of the communities under scrutiny. Scribner and Cole maintained that the methods and problems of school could not be attributed to the problems and technologies of everyday life or the home; rather, the focus should be on rethinking the social organization of education and its effects: “Searching for specific ‘incapacities’ and ‘deficiencies’ are socially mischievous detours” (p. 558). There are differences in the way that the capacities of individuals and their communities are brought to bear in various problem-solving situations; what is needed, then, is a functional analysis of the phenomenon under study at several levels of social organization (p. 558). Drawing on cross-cultural research that documents how different educational experiences give rise to different functional learning systems (Bruner, 1964, 1966;

Greenfield & Bruner, 1966, 1969; Luria, 1971), Scribner and Cole, used the concept of the “functional learning system . . . to identify the varying ways basic capacities are integrated and brought into play for the purposes at hand” (p. 553). In literacy, this research highlighted the importance of studying literacy in the context of its use.

In examining the consequences of literacy and intellectual skills, Scribner and Cole (1973, 1981) were interested in whether differences in the social organization of education promote differences in the organization of learning and thinking skills in the individual (p. 553). To distinguish dominant conceptions of literacy from others, these researchers employed the metaphors of “literacy as development” and “literacy as practice” (p. 449) to examine the nature of evidence considered crucial for developing hypotheses about literacy and in the procedures for relating evidence to theory. The object of this work was to advance an approach to literacy that “moves beyond generalities to a consideration of the organization and use of literacy in different social contexts” (p. 450).

This cross-cultural work was instrumental in challenging notions about the affordances of literacy skills across settings and about the extant methods of studying literacy in nondominant communities. Scribner and Cole (1978) combined experimental psychological methods with ethnography to develop robust explanations regarding the practices and uses of literacy by the Vai people in Liberia focusing on what the researchers referred to as *literacy practices*—a unit of analysis to capture the sociocultural basis of literacy across the various activity systems of Vai life. A focus on practice was central to capturing the socially mediated nature of literacy in situ and the role of sociocultural history in the development of literacies. Scribner and Cole’s functional analysis of Vai practices revealed that “schooling and the acquisition of literacy are separate activities” and led the researchers to reconsider the nature of literacy and its intellectual effects (p. 448). They argued that their functional analysis emerging from the Vai research could be useful for educational research in the United States. An emerging key principle to be employed suggests that different literacy practices should be analyzed independently, given that particular skills are promoted by particular literacy practices. Hence, it is essential to learn, as much as possible, how the individual and the community practice literacy. A second, related principle suggests that writing and reading activities in learning environments should be tailored to desired outcomes (Scribner & Cole, 1978).

Conceiving of literacy as a social practice has gained significant currency; this view has been extended in research across literacy, education, and anthropological literatures, with qualitative and discourse analytic methods at the methodological forefront. For example, cross-cultural literacy studies organized around a cultural–historical perspective provided alternative conceptions of literacy and methods of study that called into question the deficit paradigms used to define the language and literacy practices of cultural communities (Greenfield, 1972; Heath, 1983; Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). In educational contexts, the linguistic turn in social science research brought about a realignment in educational research; that is, it introduced new criteria and models for classroom research that allowed for more

“contextual explanations of literacy as a social practice” (Luke, 1992, p. 107). Despite this shift, researchers from this tradition have remained largely acritical and have ignored how local and contextual issues relate to larger social issues—“the complex fabric of texts and discourses through which social representation and reproduction is effected” (Luke, 1992, p. 108). This omission leaves open the possibility of essentializing the literacy practices of individuals and communities.

In response to autonomous and acritical models of literacy that dominated the field up to the 1980s, new literacy studies research (Gee, 1991; Street, 1984, 2003) has focused on producing more complex understandings of literacy, particularly in terms of power relations and the social nature of literacy activity, through ethnographies of literacy that document the situated literacy practices that constitute everyday life in particular ecologies (Barton, 2001; Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanic 2000; Street, 1984, 1993).

This social view of literacy requires detailed, in-depth accounts of the actual practices of people in different cultural settings, to understand meanings of literacies across cultures and context (Street, 1993, p. 1). Situating people’s literacy practices in local and broader historical contexts provides complexity to and understanding of how repertoires of literacy practice come into being and so necessarily challenge approaches to studying literacy as an “autonomous” skill. For Street (1993), autonomous models of literacy “assume the technology of literacy itself had ‘impact.’” Instead, “it is the social construction of such technologies and their instantiation in specific social context that creates such ‘impact’” (p. 1). By linking local literacy practices with distal influences and practices, new literacy studies address the problem of viewing global and dominant literacies as being static, unchanging, and immune to the influences of local practices or the processes of hybridization resulting from local–global contact. For example, Kulick and Stroud’s (1993) study of the appropriation of new literacy practices brought by missionaries to New Guinea found that people take hold of the new practices and so adapt them to local situations. According to Street (2003), these “local–global encounters around literacy, then, are always a new hybrid rather than a single essentialized version of the other” (p. 80); Furthermore,

it is these hybrid literacy practices that [new literacy studies] focuses upon rather than either romanticizing the local or conceding the dominant privileging of the supposed “global.” In terms of practical applications, it is the recognition of this hybridity that lies at the heart of an [new literacy studies] approach to literacy acquisition regarding, for instance, the relationship between local literacy practices and those of the school. (p. 80)

The lens of hybridity has been central in capturing the consequences of intercultural exchange, including border crossing and boundary crossing experienced by students from nondominant communities. Increased transnational migration, new diasporic communities, and the proliferation of media technologies have resulted in a variety of intercultural activities in which a range of linguistic practices become available to members of nondominant communities (Gutiérrez, 2008b). The resulting “linguistic bricolage” (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004, p. 32) reflects the ways that the local and the global are always implicated in the everyday linguistic practices of nondominant students, thus challenging narrow and essentialized notions of students’ linguistic

repertoires. Documenting the hybrid language practices³ that students employ in school settings also calls into question dichotomous views of home and school, everyday and school-based literacies, and formal and informal practices that are not very useful in understanding students' literacy repertoires or the role that language plays in learning processes (Gutiérrez, 2008a; Gutiérrez, 2008b; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-Lopez, & Tejada, 1999; Gutiérrez & Lee, in press; Gutiérrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995; Lee, 2007, 2008).

It is against this backdrop of cultural-historical views of literacy (Cole, 1996; Engeström, 1987; Rogoff, 2003) that we examine how conceptions of literacy, risk, diversity, and difference have helped shape approaches to addressing differential performance in literacy learning for students from nondominant communities. We also note how approaches to mediating students' literacy skills are imbued with discourses of difference and deficit views that undergird interventions for students "at risk." Such approaches are organized around varying views of how to remedy students' literacy skills, including "fixing" individual students and their home literacy practices to help ensure their success in school.

We explore how these deficit discourses and approaches to remediation have played an important role in education and, specifically, how inexperienced readers and writers and the instruction they receive have been defined. We then describe approaches that are oriented toward more expansive views of literacy learning, particularly to members of nondominant communities. Finally, we move to a discussion of how difference and risk have been conceived in educational research to show how the history of their use is implicated in literacy studies.

THE DISCOURSES OF DIFFERENCE AND DIVERSITY

Luis Moll (2001) has written that the most common educational response to diversity has been to eliminate it and to practice, what Joel Spring (1997) terms, *deculturalization*. Or, as Michael Cole (1998) has put it, there are two ways to deal with diversity: make it go away or make use of it as a resource. Seeing diversity as a resource requires rethinking notions of culture and cultural communities and understanding what is truly cultural about what people do. Culture is "the artifact-saturated medium of human life" (p. 294). Cole and a growing number of researchers employ a cultural-historical activity theoretical (CHAT) approach to organize new forms of educational activity in which diversity is a resource and heterogeneity is a design principle. Understanding the organizing principles of a CHAT, then, is instructive to this review, and Cole has highlighted the key principles of such an approach:

1. The basic premise of a CHAT approach is that human beings have the need and ability to mediate their interactions with each other and the nonhuman world through culture.
2. Culture is conceived of as human being's "social inheritance." This social inheritance is embodied in artifacts, aspects of the environment that have been transformed by their participation in the successful goal-directed activities of prior generations. They have acquired value.

3. Artifacts, the constituents of culture, are simultaneously material and ideal/symbolic. They are materialized in the form of objects, words, rituals, and other cultural practices that mediate human life. Culture is exteriorized mind; mind is interiorized culture.
4. The “effective environments” of mental life are taken to be the different practices or forms of activity the person engages in. Humans are created in joint, mediated activity.
5. Consequently, it is by analyzing what people do in culturally organized activity, people-acting through mediational means in a context, that one comes to understand the process of being human. Mediation of action through culture in social interaction is the essential precondition for normal human development.
6. Because cultural mediation is a process occurring over time, a CHAT perspective emphasizes that it must be studied over time [and scale]. An implication of this view is that all human beings are fundamentally hybrids of the phylogenetic and the cultural.
7. In addition to focusing researchers on time and change, a CHAT perspective requires them to focus on the social/spatial ecology of the activities they study—the relation of activities to their institutional arrangements.
8. A CHAT perspective places a special emphasis on the principle of multivoicedness, the principle that every form of human interaction contains within it many different selves, arranged in multiple, overlapping, and often-contradictory ways. The contradictions, experienced by us as conflicts, are a major source of change. It is diversity all the way down.
9. The acid test of the theory is its success in guiding the construction of new, more humane forms of activity. (pp. 291–292)

This instrumental view of culture and its emphasis on the social and cultural organization of human activity have been fundamental to the study of people's practice and so have implications for how to design robust educational ecologies where diversity is viewed as a resource for expansive learning (Engeström, 1987). As Cole (1998) has observed,

it is these patterned ways of co-confronting life with one's social group that serve as the “units of selection” by which parts of the vast pool of cultural knowledge are made a part of the conduct of current actions. These units are what I have referred to as *activities*, or as *cultural practices*. (p. 274)

Using cultural practices as a unit of analysis challenges approaches in which culture is based on genetics or deficit notions that view the practices of particular communities as being homogeneous, unchanging, and deviant from what is considered normative. One salient example is the culture of poverty—a metaphor influenced by Oscar Lewis (1966)—which attributed shortcomings of individuals and groups to deficits in their cultures (Foley, 1997).

Human difference has been historically addressed as being problematic in society, whereby at times the very approaches designed to support students serve to reaffirm

difference (Minow, 1990). The difference framework involves marshalling deficit-driven notions in which some populations of students are described as suffering from cultural deprivation, living in a culture of poverty (Lewis, 1966), or being part of the underclass—constructs that suggest a fixed or comparative norm. Such theories are rooted in deficit thinking, a view that posits that students who fail in school do so because of internal deficits or deficiencies rather than external attributions of school failure (Valencia, 1997, p. 2; Valencia & Solorzano, 1997). Drawing on Bernstein's work, Hess and Shipman (1965) advanced the notion of linguistic deprivation to describe the language practices of working-class children.

Such discourses about children and youth "at risk" are often organized around medical or pathological orientations that perpetuate negative or stereotypical assumptions about students who come to be known as the problem rather than a population of people who are experiencing problems in the educational system. In a stratified society, differences are never just differences; they are always understood, defined, and ranked according to dominant cultural norms, values, and practices (Gutiérrez & Orellana, 2006, p. 506). One such strategy has been described as "blaming the victim," a practice in which policy and programs intend to change people rather than the systems in which people participate. Understanding social problems in terms of individual deficiencies results in programs designed to correct deficiencies, and according to Ryan (1971), "the formula for action becomes extraordinarily simple: change the victim" (p. 3). More than 30 years after Ryan's analysis and despite some recognition of the structural failures of schools, new explanations for school failure still attribute it to individuals and so intertwine notions of innate or class and cultural deficiencies (Dabney, 1980, pp. 8–9).

CULTURAL MISMATCH THEORY

Cultural frameworks, such as cultural mismatch theory and cultural deprivation theory (see J. Baratz & Baratz, 1970; S. Baratz & Baratz, 1970), have endured as explanations for the persistent underachievement of nondominant groups, and they have bolstered ideologies that conflate race/ethnicity with culture and social class to highlight the nonalignment in the cultural practices of home and school. Cultural mismatch theory locates its explanation of the underperformance or underachievement of nondominant students in the nonalignment of the cultural practices of the home and school. The implicit comparison in mismatch explanations between home and school is problematic in a number of ways. First, comparisons within this framework presume a static monolithic family and cultural community in which there is little variance in the ways and extent to which individuals and groups participate in the valued practices of the community. The focus is on culture, the noun, in which what is cultural about people's practices is presumed by virtue of their membership in a cultural community rather than by their history of involvement in everyday practices. Without accounting for both the regularity and the variance in cultural communities, it is difficult to account for change or understand that change in the individual involves change in the practices in which the individual participates (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003).

Further, grounding comparisons about student achievement and potential in analytical processes that rely on dichotomizing home and school, formal and informal learning, and school-based and everyday knowledge makes it more difficult to document students' repertoires of practice developed across the practices that constitute everyday life. The concept of repertoires of practice employed here is best understood as people's ways of engaging in activities stemming from participation in a range of cultural practices. This requires a shift in perspective from the discontinuities of home and school, for example, to documenting people's history of involvement in practices of the cultural community. Cultural differences from this perspective are attributed to the variation in individuals' involvement in common or shared practices of the particular cultural ecology (Gutiérrez & Correa-Chavez, 2006; Rogoff, 2003).

In educational contexts, Henry Trueba (1988) was instrumental in challenging culturally based explanations of minority students' academic achievement. In response to Ogbu's (1978) taxonomy of minority groups as "autonomous," "immigrant," or "castelike," Trueba's work advanced a framework that argued against the commonly used dichotomies—for example, macro versus micro, ethnographic and applied versus theoretical (pp. 270–271). For Trueba, Ogbu's study lacked sufficient empirical evidence for the scale of the claims being made. Ogbu's grand theory of the underachievement of minority populations required an overgeneralization about distinct student populations; the resulting analysis was reductive, and it was organized around classifications that did not account for the significant variance in cultural communities. Accordingly, Ogbu's theory lacked explanatory power regarding the success of many minority students.

In contrast to positing simplistic assimilationist frameworks that contribute to uncomplicated renderings of people and their communities, Trueba's (1988) work emphasized the centrality of the cultural community and context-specific influences. Sociohistorical theory was advanced as the conceptual lens for understanding and explaining successful learning activities and individuals' participation therein. From a Vygotskian perspective, "academic failure or success of children is not a personal attribute of any child, nor a collective characteristic of any ethnic group, but a social phenomenon linked to historical and social conditions" (p. 282).

Trueba (2002) argued that immigrants necessarily develop multiple identities to negotiate new environments and their demands. Moreover, this flexibility to cross borders and boundaries and to address oppressive practices and economic constraints can be understood as a form of cultural capital, or cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005), including the double consciousness about which Du Bois (1903/1989) wrote.

Trueba (1990) highlighted the role of culture in understanding students' literacy abilities, in his studies of the literacy acquisition of Latino students in two California communities: San Diego and Ventura-Oxnard. Of importance to Trueba, assessing students' competence required observing their participation in literacy practices across a range of tasks and boundaries "in a larger social, psychological and historical context" (p. 2). Documenting the ethnography of communication and participation revealed abilities, identities, and forms of competence that were otherwise often invisible:

Failure is not individual, so much as it is a failure of the sociocultural system which denies the child an opportunity for social intercourse, and thus for cognitive development. "Academic failure" is a sociocultural phenomenon fully understandable only in its macrohistorical, economic, and political contexts. (p. 5)

Although Trueba argued that children should participate in socioculturally appropriate contexts, his sociocultural approach helped to avoid generalized treatment of cultural communities that essentialized their members and their practices; instead, Trueba looked to the ways that "failure" is not an individual accomplishment.

To be sure, balancing the need to account for both the regularity and variance in culture and avoiding generalizations has been challenging; making culture a trait of the individual or normalizing a cultural community against a dominant norm often has become the default explanation. This is particularly the case for students who do not fit the mold of what American schools consider "normal" (Deschenes, Cuban, & Tyack, 2001) and who are defined as underachieving, having defects in intellect or character, differences in cultural background, or practices that contribute to students' underperformance; from this perspective, the causes of student 'failure' can be located in the "mind and language of the individual" (Cuban and Tyack, 1988, p. 315), not in the ways learning and instruction are organized in institutional settings.

The attribution of failure to students' individual traits has facilitated the practice of labeling students as "at risk" or "low achievers" (Cuban & Tyack, 1988; Hull, Rose, Fraser, & Castellano, 1991). As Stanley Zehm (1973) reported, a student who had difficulty in school in the early 19th century was known as being a "dunce," "shirker," or "loafer" or being "stupid," "depraved," incorrigible," or "vicious." Of consequence, these labels attribute identities and thus suggest plans of intervention because "contained in a name, either explicitly or implicitly, is both an explanation and a prescription [that reveal] a set of religious and moral convictions that placed responsibility for behavior and achievement in the sovereign individual" (Cuban & Tyack, 1988, p. 4, as cited in Hull et al., 1991, pp. 311–312).

RETHINKING DIFFERENCE

The social movements of the 1960s resulted in some shift in the discourse, from individual to societal failure, although the resulting economic explanations still relied on deficit, if not pathological, renderings of the cognitive abilities of nondominant and working-class cultures (Cuban & Tyack, 1988, p. 312). Rose (2004) deftly addresses the politics of intelligence in *The Mind at Work*, where the issue of how views of intelligence are "classed" is elaborated in studies of the cognitive demands of everyday work. Drawing on interdisciplinary approaches to study knowledge at work in a range of skilled labor professions, Rose detailed intelligence, learning, reasoning, problem solving, and the strategic use of skills in blue-collar and skilled work. In doing so, Rose took apart notions of intelligence that made implicit judgments about working-class jobs. He developed rich accounts regarding the range of cognitive skills and strategies employed—from the importance of memory in waitressing, to the complex mathematical and diagnostic skills used by carpenters, electricians, plumbers, and hair stylists. In documenting the intelligence of working-class, skilled workers, Rose revealed the

limitations of previous understandings of cognition in work, and through this analysis, he pushed us to think about the definition of intelligence that best befits a democracy.

Valencia and Pearl (1997) took a prognosticatory approach to examine the sustainability of deficit explanations and cultural deficiency arguments regarding the academic performance and potential of students from nondominant communities. Their analyses relied on sociodemographic realities and trends; the consequences attributed to the end of school desegregation; the ways that the economy, politics, and education intermingle; and, as a result, an increasing anti-deficit-thinking discourse. Given the current sociodemographic trends, deficit thinking “is likely to gain momentum and currency” (p. 245) because high-poverty schools are likely to remain primary sites of educational research and intervention but with relatively limited change.

This is the case in the field of literacy, where deficit notions persist in the discourses, orienting frameworks, policies, and approaches that propose educational interventions supported by ideologies that depend on labeling and classifying students along a number of dimensions—principally by mental ability. A hallmark characteristic of interventions for students from nondominant communities in underresourced schools places the onus of change on the individual student (Artiles, 1998). Consider, for example, a language-development program created and offered more than 40 years ago designed to address the “linguistic deprivation” of poor African American students (Bereiter & Engelman, 1966). This program emphasized rote and unchallenging verbal stimulation to address students’ “nonstandard” language practices. Reductive literacy practices are increasingly commonplace in school districts with large numbers of English learners. One prevalent practice involves adopting curricula designed for special-needs students or for young students with demonstrated low abilities, as an intervention for students for whom English is not the home language. For example, in one large district with a sizable number of English learners, a reading intervention program entitled High Point (Schifini, Short, & Tinajero, 2001), intended for use with struggling readers in lower grades, is used for high school English learners despite its intended use (Martínez, Moreno, Morales, & Hopkins, 2008).

American schools are driven by a preoccupation with identifying children in terms of categories that the schools themselves have constructed for them. What conceptions of learning and learners are at work in current programs for students from nondominant communities? What to do and how to instructionally intervene have been central empirical questions in regard to students whose literacy practices deviate from normative views of literacy. The research and practice in special education have tended to reveal particular assumptions about human development and learning where notions of variability in those domains are arranged in normal distributions and where points in such distributions come with particular identities (e.g., average, at risk, disabled, remedial, gifted). This perspective highlights the view that risk is a probabilistic notion about future performance, a stark contrast to Cazden’s (1981) instructive notion of performance before competence in zones of possibility. We turn briefly to the field of special education—where this preoccupation with risk has been particularly evident—to help us rethink how difference is negotiated.

Artiles's (1998) analysis of the deficit framework at work in the disproportionate representation of ethnic and linguistic minority students in special education points to the field's inattention to the sociohistorical contexts of development of these students; historically, attention has focused on comparing and holding members of nondominant communities against a normative view that can render them only "different." As noted by Minow (1990, as cited in Artiles, 1998), *difference* is a comparative term that highlights what students from nondominant communities are not. Here, "sameness is sine qua non for equality" (Artiles, 1998, p. 32), or, in Minow's words (1990, as cited in Artiles, 1998), "to be equal one must be the same, [and] to be different is to be unequal or even deviant" (p. 32).

For Artiles (1998), notions of difference are undergirded by a set of assumptions and practices that sustain the normative backdrop against which students are measured. One assumption is that difference resides within the individual; that is, difference is a trait of the individual. Such assumptions are perpetuated in part by the culturally bound perspective of researchers who are neither self-conscious nor transparent about how their sociocultural experiences contribute to how they understand and instantiate difference in the research process (Arzubiaga, Artiles, King, & Harris-Murri, 2008). At the same time, there is a tendency in research to ignore or minimize the standpoint of the person who is the object of scrutiny and investigation. Following Rogoff (1995), one means to disrupt the practices-of-difference analysis is to attend to the multiple and mutually constitutive frames of development: the individual, the interpersonal, and the institutional. In this way, the interrelationship between the individual and the cultural practices is made evident.

As McDermott, Goldman, and Varenne (2006) have argued, the practice of labeling and classifying students is deeply implicated in special education in the United States; it is a practice that has helped shape how educational researchers view students with disabilities and those with nonstandard practices. Understanding students' practices and abilities in relation to their contexts of development counters the tendency to locate disability solely within individuals. The identity labels associated with disability become more complex and problematic when "the ambiguities of racial, ethnic, and linguistic labels and the competitive and politically consequential agendas for which the labels are made relevant, and the ties between [learning disabled] and minority status become intertwined" (p. 12).

McDermott and colleagues (2006) conducted a micro-analytic study of how the cultural practices of schools bestow labels on students that belie their actual skills. Their cultural approach

takes individuals seriously by focusing on their environments and rarely allows a single person to bear the undue burden of being targeted, accused, labeled, explained, worried about, remediated, or even rehabilitated without an account of the conditions in which he or she lives. (p. 13)

Although this cultural approach does not directly address the learning disability, it does account for the affordances and constraints of the discursive practices and social

arrangements among people that result from the categories and contexts of learning disability. In this study, “doing school”—that is, doing the valued and recognized practices of schooling institutions—became a measure of success in ways that obfuscated the expertise and more appropriate measures of the schooling competence of two Latino students and one African American student. “Doing school” involves a kind of procedural display in which students learn how to display pseudo-learning without demonstrating competence of subject matter knowledge (Bloomer, Puro, & Theodorou, 1989). “Doing school” becomes an increasingly valued practice in educational efforts for students whose home language practices are marked in learning activities and where English, the unmarked language, is normative (Gutiérrez, 2008b).

How difference and disability are viewed, studied, and interpreted is relevant to the focus of this chapter insofar as it points to the need to counter the tendency to categorize and label students in ways that delimit the possibility of participating in learning arrangements and curricular opportunities, developing identities, and becoming full members of robust and equitable learning ecologies. It calls into question quick-fix approaches organized around generic forms of support and generalized understandings of intelligence and competence (Rose, 2004). It also calls for a more accurate assessment of the skills and practices of students who might otherwise be regarded as being underskilled. From this perspective, attention shifts to how the social organization of American classrooms first arranges for children to look like failures and then attributes their lack of success to racial, gender, language, or community membership.

Trent, Artiles, and Englert (1998) advance a similar argument about special education’s long history of overrelying on deficit notions to develop models of instruction and intervention for special education students. These models have included “child saving” and social control theories that promote the classification and segregation of students: programs for immigrants, English learners, and economically underresourced students—in other words, the continued segregation of children “on the basis of race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status” (p. 283). Similar to McDermott and colleagues (2006), Trent and colleagues argue that the presumption of children’s learning disabilities allows people to systematically ignore or miss what children can actually accomplish beyond the boundaries defined by tests, labels, or *a priori* categories.

As such, social constructivist and sociocultural approaches to understanding and responding to disability are proposed as an alternative to behaviorist and cognitive models of disability, in which the unit of analysis is often narrowly concentrated on the individual, with the concomitant focus on deficits. Here, a sociocultural approach challenges long-standing views that disability is located within individuals; it instead redirects the focus on developing situated notions of competence, ability, risk, disability, and difference as being culturally mediated.

A more ecological and situated understanding of learning shifts to a different set of approaches, focusing on apprenticeship in applied settings, access to empowering modes of discourse, guided instruction that leads to self-regulated learning, and understanding learning in cultural–historical contexts. As Trent and colleagues (1998) suggest, this

contextualized approach to special education was evident in literacy programs for children with mild disabilities, organized around the principles listed above—notably, reciprocal teaching in literacy instruction (see Palincsar, 1984, 1986; Palincsar & Brown, 1989) and the Early Literacy Project (see Englert & Mariage, 1996; Englert, Tarrant, Mariage, & Oser, 1994, as cited from Trent et al., 1998). Rather than emphasize deficit areas and remedial approaches to address those deficiencies, such programs organized learning in ways that employed what students knew, to support the development of language and reading comprehension.

GENRES OF DIFFERENCE AND THE LANGUAGE OF EXCLUSION

Paraphrasing McDermott and colleagues (2006), culture is both enabling and constraining. This means that people must continually negotiate the affordances and constraints of the cultural practices of the ecology: those socially inherited, as well as those newly formed. Discourses and ideologies play important mediating and consequential roles in cultural activity, including schooling. Claims about the success and failure of students from nondominant communities are too often advanced without careful examination of the intellectual history of the constructs or descriptors employed, their history of use, or the consequences of their use on the target population. Consider the concepts of cultural mismatch, cultural deprivation, and cultural deficit advanced earlier in this chapter.

Rigorous, accurate, and useful empirical work involves a kind of theoretical integrity in which there is a principled congruence of constructs, methods, and orienting frameworks to explain a phenomenon. Gutiérrez and Orellana (2006) address the commonplace approaches to conceptualizing and reporting research about students from nondominant communities (specifically, English learners)—that is, approaches that unwittingly create or reinforce deficit views of students and their communities. The authors point to a new genre that has emerged in the reporting of research that has come to characterize studies of difference, risk, and nondominant student populations. One salient characteristic of this genre involves the ways in which the “problem” of nondominant students is typically framed as a comparison with a “mainstream” norm. For example, the home literacy practices of English learners are often compared with school-based practices in ways that can inadvertently construct home practices in terms of deficit. The point of the comparison may be to contrast abilities, home practices, attitudes, or school achievement.

The issue here is that the constructs and descriptors that researchers use may reveal a set of assumptions about normativity that necessarily involves an implicit comparison of nondominant and dominant (normative) communities, even when no empirical comparison has been conducted. From this perspective, instructional interventions are designed to “fix” what is broken or misaligned.

These notions of risk and difference have contributed to what Rose (1985) calls the

language of exclusion—a discourse that helps to exclude from the academic community students who are in need of “repair,” as well as helps to sustain an ideology of remediation that carries with it “the etymological wisps and traces of disease. (p. 193)

To extend the metaphor, the ideology of remediation places students “in scholastic quarantine until their disease can be diagnosed and remedied” (p. 193). We explore how this ideology is indexed in educational practices.

TRADITIONAL RESPONSES TO DIFFERENCE: THE IDEOLOGY AND PRACTICE OF REMEDIATION

The ideology of remediation is instantiated in practices organized around beliefs about literacy and learning. In our work (Gutiérrez, Hunter, & Arzubia, 2009), we have examined approaches to remediation for students from nondominant communities, many of whom are immigrants and English learners. In the aggregate, students from nondominant communities have been socialized to and through their participation in remedial courses, in which they develop unproductive and weak strategies for literacy learning. In general, their literacy instruction is organized around individually accomplished tasks with generic or minimal assistance, narrow forms of assessment, “homogeneous” grouping, and an overemphasis on basic skills with little connection to content or the practices of literacy—in short, an overemphasis on the technical dimensions of literacy. In the cases of California, Arizona, and Massachusetts, remedial instruction is delivered in a language other than the home language. In these states, we see how various ideologies of difference are indexed in pedagogies, practices, and assumptions about students from nondominant communities who require new and additional forms of assistance to “do school.” This ideology of remediation has potent policy implications; as Rose (1989) suggests, “to be remedial is to be substandard, inadequate, and, because of the origins of the term, the inadequacy is metaphorically connected to disease and mental defect” (p. 171).

The discourse of remediation has had a sustained presence in education literature, emerging as early as the 1930s, when it first appeared in publications for teachers and educators (Breneman & Harlow, 1998; Rose, 1985). In the domain of literacy, Rose (1985) notes,

We still talk of writers as suffering from specifiable, locatable defects, deficits, and handicaps that can be localized, circumscribed, and remedied. Such talk reveals an atomistic, mechanistic-medical model of language that few contemporary students of the use of language, from educators to literary theorists, would support. (p. 351)

Our biases and assumptions about difference are culturally organized; thus, our proclivity to identify and label students who perform poorly or differently, to assign them to particular treatments, to assess them in particular ways, and to make a diagnosis about their future performance in schools and often beyond reveals habits of mind that index our nation’s history with difference—primarily, race and class differences.

Our nation's preoccupation with difference and its inclination to fix perceived deficiencies helps to explain our focus in this review on the concept of remediation—a central construct used in the literature, concerned with students in need of additional support in learning situations. The term *remediation*, derivative of the Latin *rememdiūm*, is rooted in the discourse of medicine to describe the educational treatment that will “remedy” or “cure” students of the ailments that contribute to poor academic achievement, and it includes efforts to correct character flaws, improve intellectual prowess, and enhance cultural or social deficiencies (Gutiérrez et al., 2009; Hull et al., 1991). From this perspective, remedial education must be understood in its historical context and as an instantiation of how educational and social ideologies are mutually informing (Golby & Gulliver, 1985).

Throughout our educational history, students who have not been successful in school have been categorized and labeled as being incapable of learning; they have been retained, placed in special classes, tracked into low-ability classes, and often expelled from school (Oakes, 1985). Even the seminal report *A Nation at Risk* (U.S. National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) showed little awareness that schools, as currently organized, are much better calibrated to serve privileged groups than groups placed on the margin (Deschenes et al., 2001, p. 527). More recent reform efforts tend to perpetuate the same outcome for students from nondominant communities:

Despite the beliefs of the standards movement, though, there will always be a number of children who do not or cannot accomplish what their schools expect them to accomplish. In this way, the standards movement has and will have something in common with every American educational movement of the past century and a half: students who perform poorly and who fail. (p. 526)

Students who cannot meet the standards make up what Deschenes and colleagues (2001) consider the current “mismatch” group, distributed across one of four profiles prevalent in schools:

1. Students who do poorly in school have character defects or are responsible for their own performance.
2. Families from certain cultural backgrounds prepare children poorly for school and give them little support for achievement. . . .
3. The structure of the school system is insufficiently differentiated to fit the range of abilities and different destinies in life of its heterogeneous student body.
4. Children often fail academically because the culture of the school is so different from the cultural backgrounds of the communities they serve. (pp. 535–537)

Reform efforts such as the standards-based reforms require students to do more and to do it longer, or to repeat a year of school, rather than question or challenge what actually contributes to student failure in the first place. According to Deschenes and colleagues, schools must learn to adapt, address inequities (educational and social), and engage in significant transformation.

MOVING FROM REMEDIATION TO RE-MEDIATION

Remediation remains a central strategy in addressing the academic needs of students who differ from the dominant norm. In many of the current practices under No Child Left Behind (2001), remedial instruction is the default assistance strategy and the preferred pedagogical arrangement across the educational pipeline. Moreover, in an effort to provide alternative forms of instruction to mitigate underachievement, many remediation programs employed moralistic or deficit-oriented perspectives to justify their need and implementation. For example, Grimm (1996) noted that when “underprepared” students showed up in college, centers were created to “offer these unfamiliar students one last chance to remove the traces of their educational and cultural backgrounds” (p. 530). Such perspectives promote narrow notions of student ability and disregard students’ repertoires of practice (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003) as assets to successful learning (for a comprehensive overview, see Hull et al., 1991; Rose, 1985). Of consequence, these perspectives have made it more difficult to hold K–12 institutions accountable for the role in sustaining negative images of students as potential failures.

Cultural approaches informed by sociocultural views of learning and development have provided new approaches to extending students’ literacy repertoires. In contrast to the traditional “remedial” approaches to instruction previously addressed, the notion of re-mediation—with its focus on the sociohistorical influences on students’ learning and the context of their development—involves a more robust notion of learning and thus disrupts the ideology of pathology linked with most approaches to remediation. Instead of emphasizing basic skills—problems of the individual—re-mediation involves a reorganization of the entire ecology for learning and “a shift in the way that mediating devices regulate coordination with the environment” (Cole & Griffin, 1983, p. 70). Development here involves a “systems reorganization” in which designing for deep learning requires a “social systems reorganization” (p. 73) where multiple forms of mediation are in play. The concept of re-mediation constitutes a framework for the development of rich learning ecologies in which all students can expand their repertoires of practice through the conscious and strategic use of a range of theoretical and material tools.

To illustrate this concept, Cole and Griffin (1983) detail how a learning environment for elementary school students who struggle with reading was reorganized to produce improved reading results. In school settings, the comprehension activities frequently practiced by students too often prevent them from acquiring a deep understanding of the text and from engaging in literate practices. For example, one common comprehension activity (the central activity in the reading process) involves asking students to demonstrate their understanding of a text by selecting words from the text and then matching them to the question.

However, in an approach to increasing student comprehension, Cole and Griffin (1983) developed a script for a new practice—“Question Asking Reading”—in which students formulated their own questions about texts, as opposed to simply answering questions generated by someone else. In their study, Cole and Griffin

placed students into small groups, assigned roles, and provided with scripts, with individual tasks listed on cards for completion. Through this process, students were able to understand the texts in more robust ways—including those that were more in alignment with the forms of comprehension valued in school. Here, the development of a functional system for teaching reading was created to re-mediate the local practices of one learning environment, as well as the history of practices organized for children's failure (Cole, 1998).

Of significance, the approach for helping students to develop productive reading strategies was not to focus on basic skills—that is, a progression from the simple (letters and sounds) to the more complex (meaning making); instead, teaching reading effectively involved emphasis on the activity of reading itself, where the individual skills associated with reading were already part of the activity. In short, learning was organized so that individuals could participate in the social practices of reading in joint activity with others, where multiple forms of assistance were readily available (Gutiérrez et al., 2009).

RE-MEDIATING WRITING

In the domain of writing, there is comparable antecedent work that has helped push back remedial interventions for students who are unfamiliar with academic discourse and writing genres. Rose (1985, 1988, 1989); Hull et al. (1991), and Hull and Rose (1989, 1990) produced a seminal body of work that sparked a critical conversation about writing pedagogies organized around exclusionary, deficit, and narrow discourses of literacy and literacy learners and around those of intelligence. Despite a number of important studies that called for new ways to think about writing and writers (Bartholomae, 1985; Bartholomae & Petrosky, 1986; Coe & Gutiérrez, 1981; Perl, 1979; Shaughnessy, 1977), we examine this body of work because it is among the first to reflect and bring a sociocultural analysis to rhetoric and composition studies, with a focus on the effects of remedial instruction on writers' development. These writing-specific studies help to illustrate the limits of remedial education and to signal the problems of broader deficit approaches to addressing the range of literacy needs of students. As part of their new approach, Rose and Hull worked to bring together a cognitive and social model to their analysis, rather than rely solely on literary studies to examine writing development.

In "The Politics of Remediation," Rose (1989) opened a conversation about students who are in the process of extending their writing repertoires to include academic writing. By reframing student identities as "literate people straining at the boundaries of their ability, trying to move into the unfamiliar, to approximate a kind of writing they can't yet command" (p. 188), Rose reframed commonplace conceptions of writers who are new to the conventions of academic discourses, genres, and practices. And nowhere would the clash between these conventions and students' vernacular and everyday practices be more evident than in the writing tutorial centers where Rose studied students who were struggling with the new tools of the academy, where he helped them write their way into the university (Bartholomae, 1985).

Such work is not neutral; in fact, it is work that is often at odds with the ideals and practices of the academy. Remedial work has never been regarded as being a part of the work of the university but rather a necessary and marginalized enterprise (see also Gutiérrez et al., 2009; North 1998; Street & Lea, 2006). At the university level—where the intellectual class structure privileges a certain cognitive work (e.g., research)—providing students with assistance such as tutoring is devalued or marginalized (Rose, 1989). To address the structural inequities in the education of students with different and emergent literacy repertoires, Rose (1989) contextualized his study in a policy analysis that examined the ways that knowledge is structured at the university and how students are prepared to participate within that disciplinary structure. Rose noted that claims of students' failure to write academically lack historical perspective and fail to address the role that institutions play in perpetuating students' participation in remedial writing programs. Such claims that blame the victim tend to draw on three kinds of evidence to advance the "problem" of remedial writing students: declines in students' local and national test scores, increasing enrollment in remedial programs and classes, and evaluations by university professors.

Building on this theme of exposing the consequences of remedial programs, Rose (1985) call for a reconsideration of the concept and practices of remediation and the need for new approaches that capture the complex cognitive and social processes that produce writing. In contrast to text-based analyses that do not account for cognitive and social factors or that have difficulty detecting the sources of error, Rose's proposed social-cognitive approach employed fine-grained analysis, process tracing, retrospective interviews, and observation of students' writing *in situ* to help document their writing history. They argued that with methods that help to make visible a logic in students' writing, instructors can develop new understandings of students' writing, of their potential, and of the appropriate pedagogical intervention. This approach was crucial in this historical period because

the theoretical and pedagogical model that was available for "corrective teaching" led educators to view writing problems within a medical-remedial paradigm. Thus they set out to diagnose as precisely as possible the errors (defects) in a student's paper—which they saw as symptomatic of equally isolable defects in the student's linguistic capacity—and devise drills and exercises to remedy them. (p. 352)

As the enrollment of nontraditional students in 4-year institutions increased, institutions more so relied on writing courses and tutorials to provide assistance to students who were attempting to master the conventions of academic writing. Hull and Rose's studies (1989, 1990) of remedial writing instruction provided close analysis of the ways that classroom practices help to construct student identities as remedial students; it also offered a study of how institutions are complicit in perpetuating the ideologies and practices that are instantiated in remedial approaches in the academy. In "This Wooden Shack Place," Hull and Rose (1990) examined how a college student's classroom literacy practices are shaped by one's sociocultural background and individual history and the social organization of a writing conference between instructor and student. We learn how attention to the student's linguistic

and sociocultural repertoire provides not only valuable insight into his or her interpretations of text but also effective and responsive pedagogical approaches.

In a subsequent empirical work, Hull et al. (1991) elaborate the discussion of remediation as a social construct—that is, the product of perceptions and beliefs about literacy and learning—and they call for new methods that provide a fine-grained analysis against a cultural–historical backdrop to understand students’ writing practices and challenge narrow notions of intelligence. To connect these local classroom practices with larger systemic structures and ideologies, the researchers embed their case study of one student in a remedial college-level writing class within a broader history of American education where low-achieving students are considered to be “lesser in character and fundamental ability” (p. 311). This work documents how dominant discourses of remediation and teachers’ unfamiliarity with nondominant discourses can contribute to the social construction of remediation and to views of students’ thinking as being deficient—particularly, that of students whose repertoire does not include knowledge of traditional classroom discourse patterns, including the ubiquitous recitation script (Mehan, 1979).

CULTURAL MODELING

More recent approaches, organized around cultural–historical principles of learning and development (Cole & Engeström, 1993), include interpretive approaches such as cultural modeling (Lee, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2007) and the Funds of Knowledge project (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005; Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992). Researchers across disciplines responded to the importance of attending to culture in understanding students’ learning while recognizing the tendency in previous research to conflate race/ethnicity with culture in ways that reduced culture to a trait of individuals by virtue of their membership in particular communities—notably, nondominant communities. Despite clear links to earlier cultural mismatch approaches, the cultural modeling framework resolves the problems emerging in the cultural mismatch model and in related models through its use of a dynamic and processual notion of culture. Unlike approaches that rely on cultural explanations of difference, cultural modeling not only attempts to bridge home and school, as well as nondominant and dominant cultural practices; it also explores genuine connections that students can make with school-based learning. Specifically, studies within this framework examine how culture is implicated in everyday and school-based practices and knowledge domains.

Approaches that intended to challenge deficit notions regarding the literacy practices of cultural communities often unintentionally produced narrow notions of culture and the practices of the communities under study (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003). Furthermore, the deep lack of understanding regarding how to make sense of the “cultural displays of knowledge” from youth engaged in everyday practices has produced what Lee (2007) argues is a “pervasive culture of low expectations, to deficit models of student capacities, and to a myriad of misunderstandings within classrooms” (p. 25). In the field of literacy, cultural modeling has helped make visible

and reframed students' literacy practices and "repositions what might be historically viewed as vernacular practices as intellectually rich" (pp. 26–27).

The most extensive body of work within this approach is the Cultural Modeling Project, developed by Carol Lee (1995, 1997, 2000, 2007). This model relies on ethnographic and linguistic anthropological traditions to develop grounded theories about the range of practices in which students participate across the various contexts of their everyday lives and the resulting expertise. Documenting students' everyday practices provides the opportunity to map such practices onto disciplinary modes of reasoning, analyze disciplinary modes of reasoning, and then map them onto academic processes and discourses. As such, the Cultural Modeling Project "is a framework for the design of learning environments that examines what youth know from everyday settings to support specific subject matter learning" (Lee, 2007, p. 15). Finding commonalities in modes of reasoning across contexts also serves to challenge deficit notions of students' repertoires developed across nonschool settings.

In this framework, students' repertoires of practice are viewed as being integral to their learning. In her work, Lee (2007) reorganizes African American students' learning of complex literacy tropes by leveraging analogous vernacular practices with subject-matter-specific practices within school. Lee's analytical framework illustrates how the rhetorical practices of speakers of African American English, such as those evident in the act of signifying (Smitherman, 2000), are also found in the figurative language of canonical literary texts. Thus, cultural modeling and its methods of study offer a productive approach to understanding the connections between everyday and school-based practices and between everyday and school-based discourses (Lee, 1995, 1997, 2000, 2007).

One important tenet of a cultural modeling framework involves what Lee (2007) refers to as a "cultural repertoires of practice" perspective on culture, drawing on the work of Gutiérrez and Rogoff (2003); Nasir, Rosebery, Warren, and Lee (2006); and Rogoff, Paradise, Arauz, Correa-Chavez, and Angelillo (2003). For Lee, students—including those from African American and other nondominant communities—"bring important cultural resources from their home and community experiences" (p. 10). Cultural modeling sheds light on the sophisticated tacit knowledge of youth by drawing on "cultural data sets" in classroom learning—that is, artifacts with which students themselves are expert. Through an analysis of these cultural data sets, students are socialized into academic discourse as they learn more about their familiar tools and practices, as well as about unfamiliar and even alienating canonical texts.

Antecedents of the cultural modeling framework are found in the concept of funds of knowledge, developed by Luis Moll and Norma González (González et al., 2005; Moll et al., 1992). By focusing on the range of social practices in which families engage, González, Moll, and colleagues developed an approach that documents the knowledge in practice that is part of household daily routines—that is, the social practices that families arrange for everyday life. Documenting quotidian activity also makes visible the household relations of exchange across settings and social networks. In doing so, the funds-of-knowledge analytical lens helps to redefine the kind of toolkit that students from Latino households have available to them—the

linguistic, sociocultural, and emergent forms of disciplinary knowledge that become resources for learning across settings and practices.

A funds-of-knowledge framework provides opportunity for educators to examine their assumptions about the available expertise in the homes and practices of Latino families and to rethink explanations for student performance built around views of home-school dichotomies and mismatched practices of home and school. Using ethnography to identify the local funds of knowledge and social networks of exchange, teachers involved in the project become engaged in practices in which they make links between what they learn in homes and what they know in school contexts. Through participation in these practices, new forms of interaction between families and teachers have the potential to recognize and extend students' repertoires of practice and design new forms of learning activity that rely in part on a broader set of tools and practices to support literacy learning. Working within this framework, Civil (2006) developed a mathematics curriculum based on families' funds of knowledge in mathematical learning—that is, using the mathematical knowledge at work in families' practices.

Despite parallels between the two frameworks, Lee (2007) distinguishes several major differences. The first stems from the fact that a cultural modeling approach highlights the students' repertoires of practice rather than those of adults or those emerging from family networks. Second, cultural modeling focuses on the "demands" of context- or domain-specific skills, such as narrative writing in English-classroom contexts (Lee, 2007), paraphrasing across various subject matter contexts (Orellana & Reynolds, 2008), and mathematics learning (Nasir, 2000). Across both frameworks, though, "the challenge is to select highly generative cultural data sets and not to trivialize making connections between everyday knowledge and school based knowledge" (Lee, 2007, p. 35).

A cultural modeling approach then privileges the language practices of students in spaces that have historically devalued the linguistic and cultural repertoires of practice often deemed deficient or unrelated to academic achievement. For example, Lee (2007) found that when students were provided with cultural data sets that exemplified complex and dynamic figurative language—as well as interpretive problems, such as symbolism, irony, satire, and unreliable narration (e.g., rap lyrics, music videos, poetry, and canonical African American literary texts)—they developed deeper understandings of their tacit knowledge of signifying practices, including their function, range, and potential. Expertise in analyzing tacit knowledge facilitated students' potential to analyze canonical texts.

Other literacy researchers have employed a cultural modeling framework in cross-cultural studies of children's and youth's language practices. Arnetha Ball (1992, 1995, 2002; Ball & Farr, 2003), for example, has documented cultural preferences in expository writing among African American adolescent speakers of African American English. Ball examined the organizational patterns of conversational and written expository discourse of African Americans during informal contexts, and she utilized these patterns as resources to understand and produce expository writing in formal conversations and written contexts. In related work, *Exchanging Writing*,

Exchanging Cultures (Freedman, 1994) revealed how cultures of teaching and learning, in inner-city schools serving large numbers of students from nondominant groups, are organized differently at both the school level and the classroom level in different countries. This research showed that our “usual” ways of organizing teaching and learning are not necessary. For example, “mixed ability” was normal in U.K. secondary schools but unusual in U.S. schools. Similarly, teaching in the United Kingdom was characterized by its focus on developing curriculum informed by deep understandings of students and their development; in contrast, students’ learning in inner-city schools was dependent on curricular changes. A noteworthy and fundamental distinction at the curricular level was that students in the United Kingdom had the opportunity to explore one another’s cultures through the medium of writing exchanges, in which they reflected on their own cultural contexts and language practices. Studying these cultural practices of cross-cultural schooling environments provides useful insight into how to re-mediate students’ learning in U.S. contexts.

Drawing on the cultural modeling tradition, Marjorie Orellana and Jennifer Reynolds (2008) studied the everyday linguistic practices of immigrant Latino/Latina students to document the repertoires of practice of such youth who translate, or “para-phrase,” for adults in their families. Beginning with ethnographic research to find analogous modes of reasoning within communities, these researchers found that children of Mexican immigrants often translate documents that require a “paraphrasing” of highly rigorous text; of significance, the researchers identified analogues between translating (or “para-phrasing”) complex household or business interactions with the task of paraphrasing (or meaning making) in classroom activities. These students demonstrate their linguistic dexterity in their ability to perform paraphrasing tasks, despite believing that they cannot do so in school settings. In contrast to those whose work focuses on learning in a specific discipline, Orellana and Reynolds explore connections that can be made across content areas.

In related work, Martínez, Orellana, Pacheco, and Carbone (2008) drew on the cultural modeling tradition, as well as the funds-of-knowledge framework (Moll et al., 1992), to construct a curriculum informed by Mexican immigrant students’ repertoires of practice in general and translation practices in particular. This empirical work relied on qualitative approaches to document generative ways of mapping students’ “paraphrasing” skills onto academic processes—most notably, writing (Martinez et al., 2008, pp. 423–424). In this study, students first engaged in a series of writing tasks; then, they were asked to reflect on the context-specific nature of their writing practices and to draw on their knowledge regarding the ways that they would speak to each respective audience. One important goal of this work involved helping students to recognize how translation is a valuable skill both inside and outside the classroom. To make this point explicit, the research team (including the teacher) asked students to reenact scenarios for different audiences and to write to different audiences. Each audience was designated to represent peers, family members, and school faculty members, to demonstrate that students have access to various linguistic resources. The authors note that

a key step in this process is to clearly and explicitly communicate to students that it is acceptable to draw on their full linguistic repertoires. Once students understand that teachers value the skills they possess, teachers can work with them to leverage and extend those skills. (Martinez et al., p. 430)

Within a cultural modeling frame, hybrid language and literacy practices are normative and so help to support a learning ecology in which students routinely draw on their linguistic toolkit to learn (Gutiérrez et al., 1999; Manyak, 2001). As Orellana and Reynolds (2008) note, leveraging students' practices neither romanticizes nor minimizes the potential that their linguistic repertoires can have across a range of tasks, activities, and contexts. Cultural modeling also allows for the emergence of hybrid language and literacy practices and thus creates space for students to draw on the full repertoire of their linguistic and cognitive skills (Gutiérrez et al., 1999; Manyak, 2001).

Other researchers have employed a cultural modeling framework across a range of disciplinary areas to document expertise not otherwise captured in studies of non-dominant students' mathematical and science learning. In particular, Nasir's work (2000, 2005) demonstrated how the cultural displays of African American youth playing dominoes and basketball can be used to understand the mathematical concepts of averages and algorithms in school-based settings. Researchers at the Chéche Konen project at TERC (Rosebery, Warren, & Conant, 1992; Warren, Ballenger, Ogonowski, Rosebery, & Hudicourt-Barnes, 2001) documented how the Haitian Creole argumentative structure facilitated learning in the science classroom.

Across all these projects, students' repertoires of practice served as robust units of analysis for understanding ways to design productive learning environments that supported subject matter learning. These studies highlight the importance of understanding the cultural displays of knowledge that emerge in everyday practices (Lee, 2007). Evident in the cultural modeling approach is an explicit stance toward challenging long-standing narratives and practices that diminish the educational possibilities for students from nondominant communities, through its use of robust measures to document students' linguistic toolkits more accurately and more comprehensively.

DESIGNING FOR EXPANSIVE LEARNING

Engeström (2001) proposed the theory of expansive learning, within the framework of cultural-historical activity theory, as a new approach to re-mediating previous theories of learning and their intervention projects. In particular, this activity theoretical approach is used to analyze and design learning ecologies in which new forms of collective activity can occur. To illustrate how expansive learning addresses the fundamental questions of any theory of learning, Engeström combined these first-order questions with the fundamental premises of an activity theoretical approach: activity systems as the unit of analysis, the multivoicedness of activity systems, historicity, the central role of contradictions as sources of change and development in the activity system, and the possibility of expansive cycles in activity systems (pp. 136–137) necessary to promote expansive forms of learning. Researchers taking an activity theoretical approach should ask,

1. Who are the subjects of learning, how are they defined and located?
2. Why do they learn, what makes them make the effort?
3. What do they learn, what are the contents and outcomes of learning? And
4. How do they learn, what are the key actions or processes of learning? (p. 133)

Within this framework, expansive learning is defined as a historically new type of learning that emerges as participants struggle through developmental transformations in their activity systems, moving across collective zones of proximal development (Engeström, 1999, p. 3). These developmental transformations can be understood “as the construction and resolution of successively evolving contradictions in the activity system” (p. 7).

Engeström, Virkkunen, Helle, Pihlaja, and Poikela (1996), colleagues at the Center for Activity Theory and Developmental Work Research, have written that the Change Laboratory (Engeström & Engeström, 1986) is a method in which practitioners can develop new work practices through its intensive and deep transformations. Although the laboratory has been used as a primary intervention for developmental work research, we include it here because it has influenced the educational interventions of scholars across a number of countries who are interested in re-mediating students’ learning activity, including their developing more expansive forms of literacy.

The basic design of the Change Laboratory interventionist project is organized around Vygotsky’s method of dual stimulation (see van der Veer & Valsiner, 1991). A fundamental notion at work here is that the experimental task is always reinterpreted and reconstructed by the participant by “means of his or her internalized ‘psychological instruments’ that cannot be strictly controlled from the outside” (Engeström et al., 1986, p. 5). As Engeström and colleagues observe,

rather than giving the child just a task, ignoring her interpretation and reconstruction of the task, and observing how she manages, Vygotsky and his colleagues typically gave the child also potentially useful mediating artifacts—tools and signs. With them, the nature of the task could be radically changed. The potential capabilities and emerging new psychological formations of the child might be revealed. Thus, dual stimulation may also be characterized as *re-mediational design*. (p. 5)

In this work, change laboratories create “temporary activity systems that are set up within existing organizations (e.g., hospitals, schools, factories, and banks)” (Cole & Engeström, 2007, p. 504). For example, using the change laboratory methodology, Teräs (2007) developed a culture laboratory to examine interculturality and hybridity in immigrants’ education and training in a Finnish vocational education and training context.

Luria (1932) reported early work that employed Vygotsky’s method of dual stimulation. In one illustrative example, Vygotsky worked with an adult man, who was suffering from Parkinson’s disease, to re-mediate his ambulatory skills by introducing small

pieces of paper—the means of which he was able to walk across a floor. By introducing a new mediating tool, the patient was helped “to overcome the symptoms of his disease by getting him to reorganize the mental processes he used in walking” (Luria, 2006, p. 129). This method was then widely used in designing methods for re-mediating the behavior of adults with brain damage and that of mentally retarded children (Amano, 1999; Luria, 1979, as cited in Cole & Engeström, 2007).

Interventionist projects organized around a cultural–historical activity theoretical approach such as the Change Laboratory described above, around formative–experimental research (Cole & Engeström, 2007), and around social design experiments (Vossoughi & Gutiérrez, 2008) center attention on a systems reorganization. Formative experiments are designed to coincide with the “time course of the ‘formative’ (developmental) processes under examination” (Cole & Engeström, 2007, p. 493). Similarly, social design experiments, organized around equity-oriented principles and expansive forms of learning, are oriented toward transformative ends through mutual relations of exchange among participants. Grounded in a humanist approach to research and a cultural–historical approach to learning and development (Cole, 1996; Cole & Engeström, 1993), this interventionist research is concerned with social consequences and transformative potential (Vossoughi & Gutiérrez, 2008). Social design experiments are open systems that are subject to revision, disruptions, and contradictions and are co-designed with researchers and the target community (Engeström, 2004).

This process entails a transformation in the social organization of learning, the social relationships, the forms and uses of artifacts, and the kinds of available assistance to ratchet up the possibilities for expansive learning. In the United States, these projects are situated in an activity theoretical tradition of human development to argue for a fundamental change in the way that instruction is organized that serves students who are struggling with academic work and in the educational and social inequities that they face.

In our work in literacy (Gutiérrez, 2008a; Gutiérrez et al., 2009), we elaborate the concept of re-mediation introduced by Cole and Griffin (1983) and Engeström’s (2001) concept of expansive learning to redefine the object of re-mediating activity (Cole & Engeström, 1993) as meaningful learning in robust ecologies, as opposed to “fixing” the individual. Here, re-mediation of the learning ecology involves the reorganization of the activity system, including the social organization of learning, the social relationships, the division of labor, and the artifacts in use. The intercultural and hybrid nature of human activity, including classrooms and other learning environments, makes polycultural strategies and solutions an effective means to respond to diversity. Cole (1998) suggests that “In recognition that multiple cultures are present in every classroom, and that whenever culture-using creatures interact, they create between them a hybrid subculture, appropriate to the culture it mediates” (p. 300).

One hybrid collective activity system, termed *third spaces* (Gutiérrez, 2008a; Gutiérrez et al., 1995), emphasizes heterogeneity as an organizing principle—heterogeneity in the language practices; in age, grade, sex, gender, and race/ethnicity;

and in the tools, the forms of assistance, and the social organization and distribution of people with varying familiarity with reading and writing in the academy. These social design experiments (Vossoughi & Gutiérrez, 2008) are organized around expansive forms of learning, powerful literacies, and hybrid language practices that result from the intercultural exchange and boundary crossing involved in students' everyday lives. Mediational artifacts such as syncretic texts, designed to exploit the existing hybridity, help to create particular social environments of development in which students begin to reimagine who they are and what they might be able to accomplish, academically and beyond.

We highlight the syncretic literacy practice as one productive mediational artifact used to extend students' literacy repertoires. By design, the syncretic text draws on several seemingly contradictory or inharmonious conventions and practices—namely, a familiar cultural practice or a vernacular form of language with written texts that demand attention to the conventions of the academy and the editorial assistance of peers and instructors. The basic rule of re-mediation here involves an expansive, hybrid, and additive approach to difference and diversity, in which the social rules of participation and learning and the division of labor are re-mediated by a social imagination oriented toward new forms of collective activity and new uses of the technologies of reading and writing. These hybrid polycultural spaces are also exemplified in the Fifth Dimension project (a tertiary artifact; Cole, 1996; Vásquez, 2003) and in Change Laboratories (Engeström, 1998; Engeström, *in press*).

RE-MEDIATING INQUIRY: CONCLUDING COMMENTS

We conclude this review by returning to the discussion with which we began this chapter. Narrow notions of student ability and literacy learning are linked in important ways to beliefs about culture and cultural communities. They are also linked to the methods of inquiry employed to define and measure student competence. The long-standing practice of using one method to assess learning and achievement has made it increasingly difficult to identify and document students' repertoires of practice or view their linguistic toolkits as assets to learning (Erickson & Gutiérrez, 2002). This issue has been extensively addressed in previous research, and it was substantively elaborated in the work produced by the Laboratory for Comparative Human Cognition over the past decades (Cole, Engeström, & Vásquez, 1997).

In 1982, Michael Cole, Lois Hood, and Ray McDermott published a groundbreaking paper about the ecological invalidity of making inferences from laboratory-based observations, tasks, and tests to intellectual behavior observed and documented in the practices of everyday life. One significant observation advanced in this work emphasized the essential importance of addressing the dynamically organized influence of individuals on their environment as being fundamental to the organization of people's behavior (Cole et al., 1982). In this work, Cole and colleagues did not question the merit of cognitive theories and their use in laboratory settings or with experimental design; instead, their point was to demonstrate that theories and models emerging from laboratory or contrived settings should not be used to make predictions

about human activity outside the laboratory. Cole et al. (1982) and others (Erickson & Gutiérrez, 2002; Scribner, 1976, 1985) have suggested that understanding and analyzing human behavior must begin with rich description of an everyday practice where the phenomenon under study can be observed in some systematic way.

The consequences—especially in relation to matters of race and ethnicity in cross-cultural research—have significance to dilemmas found in research today. In speaking to the nature and origin of cultural differences, Cole et al. (1982) note the ways that deficit thinking and the penchant for remediating the “unschooled” are complicated if not sustained in experimental/cognitive laboratory-based efforts and texts:

Even with allowances for selection of artifacts and careful efforts to equate stimulus familiarity, motivation and comprehension of instructions, differences between schooled and unschooled populations were of sufficient magnitude to suggest that schooled subjects employed more powerful, flexible, and efficient ways of remembering and thinking than their unschooled counterparts. (p. 370)

This work called for the necessity of using ecologically valid tasks and tools that were representative of the ways that people actually engage the intellectual tasks and challenges of their everyday lives. It focused on developing research practices that systematically examine the “cognitive ecology” of the people studied “to discover the general sets of everyday circumstances associated with improved, experimentally controlled performance without barriers” (p. 371). The guidelines derived from their work and theoretical orientations highlight important theoretical and methodological considerations that have salience in studies concerned with addressing risk, difference, ability, and literacy learning in school settings. Their work remains instructive to literacy research with students from nondominant communities.

In sum, this review signals the need for a radical transformation in the ways that we conceive people’s literacy practices and how we extend the repertoires they develop across the practices of everyday life. Researchers have looked to cultural–historical approaches that rely on (a) “theory–practice methodology” (Cole & Engeström, 2007, p. 495) to design formative interventions, cultural modeling systems, and social design experiments and (b) social practice views of literacy to re-mediate current educational activity for students from nondominant communities. Learning across these related traditions involve amplifying students’ cultural repertoires (Cole & Griffin, 1980), as opposed to relying on the default scripts of risk, difference, and deficiency—approaches that systematically fail to re-mediate educational activity in ways that make teachers and students active agents in learning processes.

NOTES

¹We use the term *nondominant* rather than terms such as *minority*, *students of color*, and so on, given that the central issue is the power relations between those who are in power and those who, despite their growing census numbers, are not.

²Reder and Davila (2005, p. 171) summarize the link between the societal-level great divide theories (Levi-Strauss, 1962) and the great divide theories in literacy.

³*Hybrid language practices* refers to the strategic use of the complete linguistic toolkit in the service of learning.

REFERENCES

- Amano, K. (1999). Improvement of schoolchildren's reading and writing ability through the formation of linguistic awareness. In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen, & R.-L. Punamäki (Eds.), *Perspectives on activity theory* (pp. 183–205). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Artiles, A. J. (1998). The dilemma of difference: Enriching the disproportionality discourse with theory and context. *The Journal of Special Education*, 32(1), 32–36.
- Arzubiaga, A., Artiles, A. J., King, K., & Harris-Murri, N. (2008). Beyond research on cultural minorities: Challenges and implications of research as situated cultural practice. *Exceptional Children*, 74, 309–327.
- Ball, A. F. (1992). Cultural preferences and the expository writing of African-American adolescents. *Written Communication*, 9(4), 501–532.
- Ball, A. F. (1995). Text design patterns in the writing of urban African-American students: Teaching to the strengths of students in multicultural settings. *Urban Education*, 30, 253–289.
- Ball, A. F. (2002). Chapter 3: Three decades of research on classroom life: Illuminating the classroom communicative lives of America's at-risk students. *Review of Research in Education*, 26, 71–111.
- Ball, A. F., & Farr, M. (2003). Language varieties, culture and teaching the English language arts. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J. Squire, & J. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (2nd ed., pp. 435–445). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Baratz, J., & Baratz, S. (1970). Early childhood intervention: The social scientific basis of institutionalized racism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 39, 29–50.
- Baratz, S., & Baratz, J. (1970). Negro ghetto children and urban education: A cultural solution. *Social Education*, 33, 401–405.
- Bartholomae, D. (1985). Inventing the university. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write: Studies in writer's block and other composing process problems* (pp. 134–165). New York: Guilford.
- Bartholomae, D., & Petrosky, A. (Eds.). (1986). *Facts, artifacts, and counterfacts*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Barton, D. (2001). Directions for literacy research: Analysing language and social practices in a textually mediated world. *Language and Education*, 15 (2/3), 92–104.
- Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge.
- Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (Eds.) (2000). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge.
- Bereiter, C., & Engelman, S. (1966). *Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Bloome, D., Puro, P., & Theodorou, E. (1989). Procedural display and classroom lessons. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 19(3), 265–291.
- Breneman, D. W., & Harlow, W. N. (1998). Remedial education: Costs and consequences. Remediation in Higher Education Symposium. *Thomas B. Fordham Foundation Report*, 2(9), 1–57.
- Bruner, J. (1964). The course of cognitive growth. *American Psychologist*, 19, 1–15.
- Bruner, J., Oliver, R., & Greenfield, P. (Eds.). *Studies in cognitive growth*. New York: Wiley.
- Cazden, C. B. (1981). Performance before competence: Assistance to child discourse in the zone of proximal development. *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*, 3(1), 5–8.
- Civil, M. (2006). Building on community knowledge: An avenue to equity in mathematics education. In N. Nasir & P. Cobb (Eds.), *Improving access to mathematics: Diversity and equity in the classroom* (pp. 105–117). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Coe, R. M., & Gutiérrez, K. (1981). Using problem-solving procedures and process analysis to help student with writing problems. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(3), 262–271.

- Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Cole, M. (1998). Can cultural psychology help us think about diversity? *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 5(4), 291–304.
- Cole, M. (2005). Cross-cultural and historical perspectives on the developmental consequences of education. *Human Development*, 48, 195–216.
- Cole, M., & Engeström, Y. (1993). A cultural–historical approach to distributed cognition. In G. Salomon (Ed.), *Distributed cognitions: Psychology and educational considerations* (pp. 1–46). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, M., & Engeström, Y. (2007). Cultural–historical approaches to designing for development. In J. Valsiner & A. Rosa (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of sociocultural psychology* (pp. 484–507). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, M., Engeström, Y., & Vázquez, O. A. (1997). *Mind, culture, and activity: Seminal papers from the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, M., & Griffin, P. (1980). Cultural amplifiers reconsidered. In D. R. Olson (Ed.), *The social foundations of language and thought* (pp. 343–364). New York: Norton.
- Cole, M., & Griffin, P. (1983). A socio-historical approach to re-mediation. *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*, 5(4), 69–74.
- Cole, M., Hood, L., & McDermott, R. (1982). Ecological niche picking. In U. Neisser (Ed.), *Memory observed* (pp. 365–373). San Francisco: Freeman.
- Cole, M., & Scribner, S. (1974). *Culture and thought: A psychological introduction*. New York: Wiley.
- Cole, M., & Scribner, S. (1977). Developmental theories applied to cross-cultural cognitive research. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 285, 366–373.
- Collins, J. (1995). Literacy and literacies. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24, 75–93.
- Coulmans, F., & Ehlich, K. (Eds.). (1983). *Writing in focus*. New York: Mouton.
- Cuban, L., & Tyack, D. B. (1988, November). “Dunces,” “shirkers,” and “forgotten children”: *Historical descriptions and cures for low achievers*. Paper presented at the Conference for Accelerating the Education of At-Risk Students, Stanford University.
- Dabney, M. G. (1980, April). *The gifted black adolescent: Focus upon the creative positives*. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Philadelphia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED189767)
- Deschenes, S., Cuban, L., & Tyack, D. B. (2001). Mismatch: Historical perspectives on schools and students who don’t fit them. *Teachers College Record*, 103(4), 525–547.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1989). *The souls of Black folks*. New York: Bantam. (Original work published 1903)
- Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity–theoretical approach to development research*. Helsinki, Finland: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.
- Engeström, Y. (1998). Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In Engeström, Y., Miettinen, R., & Punamaki, R.-L. (Eds.), *Perspectives on activity theory* (pp. 19–38). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Engeström, Y. (1999). Learning by expanding: Ten years after. In *Lernen durch Expansion* (German edition), Introduction to *Learning by expanding*. Marbury, BdWi-Verlag. (Reihe Internationale Studien zur Tätigkeits-theorie, Bd. 5; translated by Falk Seeger.)
- Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work*, 14(1), 133–156.
- Engeström, Y. (2004). New forms of learning in co-configuration work. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 16, 11–21.
- Engeström, Y. (in press). A future of activity theory: A rough draft. In A. Sannino, H. Daniels, & K. Gutiérrez (Eds.), *Learning by expanding with activity theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Engeström, Y., & Engeström, R. (1986). Developmental work research: The approach and an application in cleaning work. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 6(1), 2–15.
- Engeström, Y., Virkkunen, J., Helle, M., Pihlaja, J., & Poikela, R. (1996). The Change Laboratory as a tool for transforming work. *Lifelong Learning in Europe*, 1(2), 10–17.
- Englert, C. S., & Mariage, T. V. (1996). A sociocultural perspective: Teaching ways-of-thinking and ways-of-talking in a literacy community. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 11, 157–167.
- Englert, C. S., Tarrant, K. L., Mariage, T. V., & Oser, T. (1994). Lesson talk as the work of reading groups: The effectiveness of two interventions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 27, 165–185.
- Erickson, F., & Gutiérrez, K. D. (2002). Culture, rigor, and science in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), 21–24.
- Foley, D. E. (1997). Deficit thinking models based on culture: The anthropological protest. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 113–131). Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis.
- Freedman, S. W. (1994). *Exchanging writing, exchanging cultures: Lessons in school reform from the United States and Great Britain*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gee, J. (1991). *Sociolinguistics: Ideology and discourses*. London: Falmer Press.
- Golby, M., & Gulliver, J. R. (1985). Whose remedies, whose ills? A critical review of remedial education. In C. J. Smith (Ed.), *New directions in remedial education* (pp. 7–19). London: Falmer Press.
- González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practice in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goody, J. (1977). *The domestication of the savage mind*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Goody, J. (1986). *The logic of writing and the organization of society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Goody, J. (1987). *The interface between the oral and the written*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Goody, J., & Watt, I. (1963). The consequences of literacy. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 5(3), 304–345.
- Greenfield, P. (1972). Oral or written language: The consequences for cognitive development in Africa, the United States, and England. *Language and Speech*, 15, 169–178.
- Greenfield, P. M., & Bruner, J. S. (1966). Culture and cognitive growth. *International Journal of Psychology*, 1(2), 89–107.
- Greenfield, P. M., & Bruner, J. S. (1969). Culture and cognitive growth. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 633–657). New York: Rand McNally.
- Grimm, M. N. (1996). Rearticulating the work of the writing center. *College Composition and Communication*, 47(4), 523–548.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2007a). Commentary on a sociocritical approach to literacy. In C. Lewis, P. Enciso, & E. Moje (Eds.), *Identity, agency, and power: Reframing sociocultural research on literacy* (pp. 115–120). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2007b). Historicizing literacy. In M. Blackburn & C. Clark (Eds.), *Literacy research for political action* (pp. ix–xiii). New York: Lang.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2008a). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 148–164.
- Gutiérrez, K. (2008b, May). *When non-dominant languages are unmarked: Using students' linguistic repertoires of practice to learn*. Plenary talk at the annual meeting of the Center for Language Interaction and Culture, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Tejada, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 6(4), 286–303.

- Gutiérrez, K., & Correa-Chavez, M. (2006). What to do about culture? *Lifelong Learning in Europe*, 3, 152–159.
- Gutiérrez, K., Hunter, J. D., & Arzubia, A. (2009). Re-mediating the university: Learning through sociocritical literacies. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4, 1–23.
- Gutiérrez, K., & Lee, C. (in press). Robust informal learning environments for youth from non-dominant groups and implications for literacy learning in formal schooling. In L. Morrow, R. Rueda, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on literacy instruction: Issues of diversity, policy, and equity*. New York: Guilford.
- Gutiérrez, K., & Orellana, M. (2006). The problem of English learners: Constructing genres of difference. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(4), 502–507.
- Gutiérrez, K., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits and repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 19–25.
- Gutiérrez, K., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus *Brown v. Board of Education*. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 445–471.
- Havelock, E. (1963). *Preface to Plato*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hess, R. D., & Shipman, V. C. (1965). Early experience and the socialization of cognitive modes in children. *Child Development*, 35, 869–886.
- Hull, G., & Rose, M. (1989). Rethinking remediation: Toward a social-cognitive understanding of problematic reading and writing. *Written Communication*, 6(2), 139–154.
- Hull, G., & Rose, M. (1990). “This wooden shack place”: The logic of an unconventional reading. *College Composition and Communication*, 41(3), 287–298.
- Hull, G., Rose, M., Fraser, K. L., & Castellano, M. (1991). Remediation as social construct: Perspectives from an analysis of classroom discourse. *College Composition and Communication*, 42(3), 299–329.
- Kulick, D., & Stroud, C. (1993). Conceptions and uses of literacy in a Papua New Guinean village. In B. Street (Ed.), *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy* (pp. 30–61). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, C. D. (1995). A culturally based cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching African American high school students skills in literary interpretation. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 608–630.
- Lee, C. D. (1997). Bridging home and school literacies: Models for culturally responsive teaching, a case for African American English. In J. Flood, S. B. Heath, & D. Lapp (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching literacy through the communicative and visual arts* (pp. 334–345). New York: Macmillan.
- Lee, C. D. (2000). Signifying in the zone of proximal development. In C. D. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives of literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry* (pp. 253–284). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, C. D. (2007). *Culture, literacy, and learning: Taking bloom in the midst of the whirlwind*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lee, C. D. (2008). 2008 Wallace Foundation Distinguished Lecture: The centrality of culture to the scientific study of learning and development: How an ecological framework in education research facilitates civic responsibility. *Educational Researcher*, 37, 267–279.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1962). *The savage mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lewis, O. (1966). The culture of poverty. *Scientific American*, 215(4), 19–25.
- Luke, A. (1992). The body literate: Discourse and inscription in early literate training. *Linguistics and Education*, 4, 107–129.
- Luria, A. R. (1932). *The nature of human conflicts*. New York: Liverwright.
- Luria, A. R. (1971). Toward the problem of the historical nature of psychological processes. *International Journal of Psychology*, 6, 259–272.

- Luria, A. R. (2006). Disturbances of brain functions. In M. Cole, K. Levitin, & A. Luria (Eds.), *The autobiography of Alexander Luria: A dialogue with the making of mind*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Manyak, P. C. (2001). Participation, hybridity, and carnival: A situated analysis of a dynamic literacy practice in a primary-grade English immersion class. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 33(3), 423–465.
- Martínez, D. C., Moreno, D., Morales, P. Z., & Hopkins, M. B. (2008, May). *Structured English immersion in LAUSD secondary classrooms: One size fits all as a restrictive language policy*. Presentation at the annual conference of the University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute, Sacramento, CA.
- Martínez, R., Orellana, M. F., Pacheco, M., & Carbone, P. (2008). Found in translation: Connecting translating experiences to academic writing. *Language Arts*, 85(6), 421–431.
- McDermott, R., Goldman, S., & Varenne, H. (2006). The cultural work of learning disabilities. *Educational Researcher*, 35(6), 12–17.
- Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Minow, M. (1990). *Making all the difference: Inclusion, exclusion, and American law*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Moll, L. C. (2001). The diversity of schooling: A cultural–historical approach. In M. de la Luz Reyes & J. J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino children* (pp. 13–28). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes to classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.
- Nasir, N. S. (2000). “Points ain’t everything”: Emergent goals and averages and percent understandings in the play of basketball among African-American students. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 31(3), 283–305.
- Nasir, N. S. (2005). Individual cognitive structuring and the sociocultural context: Strategy shifts in the game of dominoes. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 14(1), 5–34.
- Nasir, N., Rosebery, A. S., Warren, B., & Lee, C. D. (2006). Learning as a cultural process: Achieving equity through diversity. In K. Sawyer (Ed.), *Handbook of the learning sciences* (pp. 489–504). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110.
- North, S. (1998). The idea of a writing center. *College English*, 46, 433–446.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ochs, E. (1988). *Culture and language development: Language acquisition and language socialization in a Samoan village*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality and literacy*. London: Methuen.
- Orellana, M. F., & Reynolds, J. (2008). Cultural modeling: Leveraging bilingual skills for school paraphrasing tasks. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(1), 48–65.
- Palincsar, A. S. (1984, April). *Reciprocal teaching: Working with the zone of proximal development*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Palincsar, A. S. (1986). The role of dialogue in providing scaffolded instruction. *Educational Psychologist*, 21, 73–98.
- Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1989). Classroom dialogues to promote self-regulated comprehension. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching* (Vol. 1, pp. 35–71). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (Vol. 45). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 13*(4), 317–336.
- Reder, S., & Davila, E. (2005). Context and literacy practices. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*, 170–187.
- Rogoff, B. (1995). Observing sociocultural activity on three planes: Participatory appropriation, guided participation, and apprenticeship. In J. V. Wertsch, P. D. Rio & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Sociocultural studies of the mind* (pp. 139–164). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Arauz, R. M., Correa-Chavez, M., & Angelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*(1), 175–203.
- Rose, M. (1985). The language of exclusion: Writing instruction at the university. *College English, 47*(4), 341–359.
- Rose, M. (1988). Narrowing the mind and page: Remedial writers and cognitive reductionism. *College Composition and Communication, 39*(3), 267–302.
- Rose, M. (1989). The politics of remediation. In *Lives on the boundary: The struggles and achievements of America's underprepared* (pp. 167–204). New York: Free Press.
- Rose, M. (2004). *The mind at work: Valuing the intelligence of the American worker*. New York: Viking.
- Rosebery, A. S., Warren, B., & Conant, F. R. (1992). Appropriating scientific discourse: Findings from language minority classrooms. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 2*(1), 61–94.
- Ryan, W. (1971). *Blaming the victim*. New York: Random House.
- Schieffelin, B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). *Language socialization across cultures*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Schifini, A., Short, D., & Tinajero, J. V. (2001). *High point: Success in language, literature, content*. Carmel, CA: Hampton-Brown.
- Scribner, S. (1976). Situating the experiment in cross-cultural research. In K. F. Riegel & J. A. Meacham (Eds.), *The developing individual in a changing world: Historical and cultural issues* (pp. 310–321). The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.
- Scribner, S. (1985). Vygotsky's uses of history. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 119–145). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1973). Cognitive consequences of formal and informal education. *Science, 182*(4112), 553–559.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1978). Literacy without schooling: Testing for intellectual effects. *Harvard Educational Review, 29*(2), 448–461.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shaughnessy, M. (1977). *Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writers*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Smitherman, G. (2000). *Talkin that talk: Language, culture, and education in African America*. New York: Routledge.
- Spring, J. (1997). *The American school*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. V. (1993). *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. V. (2003). What's "new" in new literacy studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, 5*(2), 1–14.

- Street, B. V. (2004). Academic literacies and the "new orders": Implications for research and practice in student writing in higher education. *LATISS: Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences*, 1(1), 9–20.
- Street, B. V., & Lea, M. (2006). The "academic literacies" model: Theory and applications. *Theory Into Practice* 45(4), 368–377.
- Teräs, M. (2007). *Intercultural learning and hybridity in the culture laboratory*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Helsinki, Finland.
- Trent, S. C., Artiles, A. J., & Englert, C. S. (1998). From deficit thinking to social constructivism: A review of theory, research, and practice in special education. *Review of Research in Education*, 23, 277–307.
- Trueba, H. T. (1988). Culturally based explanations of minority students' academic achievement. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 19(3), 270–287.
- Trueba, H. T. (1990). The role of culture in literacy acquisition: An interdisciplinary approach to qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 3(1), 1–13.
- Trueba, H. T. (2002). Multiple ethnic, racial, and cultural identities in action: From marginality to a new cultural capital in modern society. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1(1), 7–28.
- U.S. National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Valencia, R. R. (1997). Conceptualizing the notion of deficit thinking. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 1–12). London: Falmer Press.
- Valencia, R. R., & Pearl, A. (1997). Epilogue: The future of deficit thinking in educational thought and practice. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 242–256). London: Falmer Press.
- Valencia, R. R., & Solorzano, D. G. (1997). Contemporary deficit thinking. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The evolution of deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice* (pp. 160–210). London: Falmer Press.
- Van der Veer, R., & Valsiner, J. (1991). *Understanding Vygotsky: A quest for synthesis*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Vásquez, O. (2003). *La clase mágica: Imagining optimal possibilities in a bilingual community of learners*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Vossoughi, S., & Gutiérrez, K. (2008). "Lifting off the ground to return anew": Documenting and designing for equity and transformation through social design experiments. Unpublished manuscript, Center for the Study of Urban Literacies, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Warren, B., Ballenger, C., Ogonowski, M., Rosebery, A. S., & Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2001). Rethinking diversity in learning science: The logic of everyday sense-making. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 38, 529–552.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69–91.
- Zehm, S. J. (1973). *Educational misfits: A study of poor performers in the English class 1825–1925*. Unpublished dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.